

Sent by the author
Receipt acknowledged
8135.6.23
5.

A
PLAIN ADDRESS
TO THE
COMMON SENSE
OF
THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

Containing an Interesting Abstract of
PAIN's LIFE AND WRITINGS.

BY
J. GIFFORD, Esq.
AUTHOR OF THE
HISTORY OF FRANCE, NEW HISTORY OF ENG-
LAND, &c. &c.

Fear God : Honour the King.	—	—	ST. PETER.
Liberty must always follow the fate of the Laws ; it must reign or	—	—	perish with them.
	—	—	ROUSSEAU.

LONDON:

Printed for the AUTHOR, sold by C. LOWNDES, No. 66,
Drury-Lane; H. D. SYMONDS, No. 20, Pater-noster-
Row; and all other Booksellers

1792.

[PRICE SIX-PENCE.]

PLAIN ADDRESS

ATTACHED to no party—an obscure atom in
the grand mass of society—I neither write for fame
nor for profit. Impelled by sentiments of loyalty
to my sovereign, and with veneration for the laws and
constitution of my country, I look with abhorrence
on any attempt to calumniate the end of to deliver
the other. These sentiments are not the result of
prejudice, but the offspring of reason: long habi-
tuated to the study of history, I have had occasion to
compare the different governments of ancient and of
modern states, and in such comparison have learn-
ed to appreciate the superior excellence of our own
in the constitution of that excellence, the venera-
tion I profess has its source thus when I contemplate
the virtues of the man, I am led to esteem the king
whom my religion teaches me to adore.

For the composition of the following pages I claim
no merit: they have been hastily written during a
short interval of repose from more laborious studies.
I have occasionally called in the opinions of others
in order to form my own; and, if I have ever made
use of their language, it has been from the convic-
tion that it was not susceptible of improvement. This
general acknowledgment will, I trust, suffice.

I am conscious that the single exertions of an op-
erative

ATTACHED to no party—an obscure atom in the grand mass of society—I neither write for fame nor for profit. Impressed with sentiments of loyalty to my sovereign, and with veneration for the laws and constitution of my country, I look with abhorrence on any attempt to calumniate the one, or to subvert the other. These sentiments are not the result of prejudice, but the offspring of reason: long habituated to the study of history, I have had occasion to compare the different governments of ancient and of modern states, and from such comparison have learned to appreciate the superior excellence of our own. In the contemplation of that excellence, the veneration I profess has its source: thus when I contemplate the virtues of the man, I am led to *esteem* the king whom my religion teaches me to *honour*.

For the composition of the following pages I claim no merit: they have been hastily written during a short interval of repose from more laborious studies. I have occasionally called in the opinions of others in order to fortify my own; and, if I have ever made use of their language, it has been from the conviction that it was not susceptible of improvement. This general acknowledgment will, I trust, suffice.

I am conscious that the single exertions of an obscure

scure individual like myself are greatly inadequate to the support of that cause I have undertaken to defend; but, I trust, my example will operate as a stimulus to men, whose abilities and consequence are better calculated for giving effect to their efforts. At all events I have discharged, what I conceive to be, my duty, and if I produce conviction on the mind of one honest member of society; if I fix the tottering firmness of one man, or recal another to the path of rectitude, I shall deem myself amply rewarded.

A
PLAIN ADDRESS
TO THE
COMMON SENSE
OF
THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

FRIENDS AND COUNTRYMEN,

CONVINCED, as I am, of the sterling sense and sound principles which form the national characteristic of the people of England, I should have deemed it unnecessary to address you, at this period, had not the most insidious arts been employed to impose on your credulity, mislead your understanding, and render the native generosity of your minds subservient to the worst of purposes. Frank, open, candid, and humane—your very virtues subject you to imposition: born free, and enjoying freedom in its fullest extent, your noble spirit of independence exposes you to the dangerous machinations of the artful and designing, who, under the specious pretext of enlarging your birthright, labour to destroy the solid foundation on which all your privileges are erected.

As I wish to make myself understood, I shall not
B imitate

imitate the conduct of those who, being interested in disguising, or rather in *disfiguring*, the truth, have endeavoured to puzzle where they could not convince, and, rejecting the plain and simple language of Common Sense, have bewildered themselves and their readers in the dark mazes of abstract theorems, and in the wily labyrinths of metaphysical disquisitions. The *mode* which has been chosen for seducing you from the plain path of duty is as singular as the attempt itself is atrocious. From the peace of 1783 to the present time, England has continued in a regular state of progressive improvement; the extension of her commerce, the encrease of her trade and manufactures, and the consequent augmentation of her revenue, to a pitch unexampled in the annals of nations, have rendered her at once an object of envy and admiration to surrounding states: while this combination of advantages, joined to her excellent constitution and salutary laws, to which, indeed, those advantages may chiefly be ascribed, has justly caused her people to be considered as the happiest in Europe. Nor were you insensible to these blessings: conscious of your superiority, and grateful for its effects, you pursued your various avocations with tranquillity and content; no murmur of complaint was heard to issue from your lips; no sentiment of disquietude found a place in your hearts. Yet, in this situation you are suddenly told, that, though you *appear* happy and really *feel* so, though you boast of your freedom, and the justice of that boast has been universally admitted, yet appearances are deceitful, and credit must be refused even to the evidence of your own senses. When in the full possession of health and spirits were a quack to attempt to prove to me that I was in a high fever or a deep consumption, I should certainly have him confined as a madman or kicked as a knave. Instead

Instead, therefore, of swallowing, with inconsiderate haste, the deadly poison of these state empirics, administered with the view to destroy that plenitude of political health which they envy you the possession of, confinement or correction should have constituted the just reward of their pernicious prescriptions. You will doubtless acknowledge, that the existence of the disorder should be fully established, ere any attempt at the application of a remedy be made.

It will not be expected that I shall undertake to comment on every subject of complaint which these abettors of faction have been studious to propagate, and anxious to impress on your minds: defects in the system of representation; pensions without services; expence of political establishments; and augmentation of imposts; are stale topics; they have been urged and re-urged by almost every member of every opposition; have been canvassed by every editor of every factious print; and have been enforced by every popular incendiary, from Wat Tyler * to Tom

B.2

Pain

* Little as I respect the memory of Wat Tyler, yet justice may, perhaps, require that I should apologize for degrading him by an indirect kind of comparison with one so infinitely beneath him in every respect as Tom Pain. But while I make this acknowledgment, I must enter a formal protest against the eulogy pronounced on that *illustrious* character by his *illustrious* successor. Pain never attempts to convey information to his readers, without misrepresenting, either from ignorance or malice, the point he undertakes to discuss.

The resentment shewn by Wat Tyler at the indecency offered to his daughter by the Tax-Gatherer, was just and proper, and the culprit certainly deserved the severest punishment. But having inflicted that punishment, why extend his resentment to the government, who most undoubtedly never authorized the commission of such an offence? The offence was the offence of the *man* and not of the *collector*. By such conduct, Tyler, appeared to act from an impulse of personal indignation, instead of proceeding on the broader ground of concern for the welfare of his country, evinced

Pain. To deny that such complaints are *wholly* destitute of foundation, would be to deviate from that strict regard to veracity to which I profess an inviolable adherence; but the grand fabric of the state should

evinced in the resistance of oppression. His whole behaviour, indeed, proves, beyond a doubt, that he was not influenced by any motives of a patriotic nature. The grand body of the insurgents, at a conference they had with the king at Mile-End-Green, at which *Tyler was not present*) required a general *pardon*; the total abolition of *slavery*; freedom of commerce in market towns, without toll or impost, and a fixed rent on lands, instead of the services due by *villennage*. These requests, which, at the same time that they breathed a spirit of liberty, were founded on reason and justice, the king complied with, and immediately granted charters for their confirmation; which were no sooner received, than this body instantly dispersed, and retired to their several homes. Now, had Tyler really been that *disinterested* man which Pain represents him, would he not, since all the grievances he complained of were redressed, have followed the example of these men, and laid down his arms? Most certainly he would; but he rather chose to act *for himself*. Let us hear what Pain *says* on the subject, and what *Historians prove*.

PAIN

and

FALSHOOD.

"The court, finding itself in
"a forlorn condition, and unable to make resistance, *agreed*,
"with Richard at its head, to
"hold a conference with Tyler
"in Smithfield, making many
"fair professions, courtier like,
"of its dispositions to redress
"the oppressions. While Richard and Tyler were in conversation on these matters, each
"being on horse-back, Walworth, then mayor of London,
"and one of the creatures of
"the court, *watched an opportunity*, and, like a cowardly
"assassin, *stabbed Tyler with a*

HISTORY

and

TRUTH.

"During these transactions, another body of the insurgents had forced the gates of the tower, where they *murdered* Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellor; and Sir Robert Hales, the treasurer, with some other persons of distinction; and then extended their ravages into the city, which it was the intention of their desperate leader, *Wat Tyler*, to reduce to ashes, after *seizing the person of the king, and putting all his nobles to death*. These diabolical designs, however, were providentially frustrated by the fol-

should be viewed, not partially but collectively, when its beauties will be found so far to exceed its defects, its utility so far to overbalance its inconveniences, that the daring hand of madness alone could seek its demolition. All human institutions are, of necessity, defective, and the man who pretends to give perfec-

"dagger; and two or three others falling upon him, he was instantly sacrificed." lowing occurrence. On the fifteenth of June, 1381, as the king was passing through Smithfield, with a slender train of sixty horse, he met Wat Tyler at the head of twenty thousand of his followers. The insolent demagogue no sooner perceived his sovereign, than he set spurs to his horse, and entered into a conference with him; having previously ordered his companions to keep back till he should give them a signal, at which they were to advance, murder all the attendants of Richard, and take the king himself prisoner. But the extreme insolence of Tyler prevented the execution of his plan, by provoking Walworth, then mayor of London, who was present, to strike him a violent blow with his mace, which felled the ruffian to the ground, when Philpot put an end to his existence, by thrusting his sword through his body!!

That the spirited exertions of the chief magistrate of the metropolis, for the suppression of tumults or the prevention of riots, should incur the resentment of the factious and designing, must rather excite indignation than occasion surprize. But we trust that the Lord Mayor of London, secure in the esteem and support of every good and worthy citizen, will never be deterred from an active and vigorous discharge of his important duties, either by the open threats of a daring incendiary, or the indirect insults of a drinking Patriot.

tion to the works of mortals, proclaims himself a fool. Vanity, generally the vice of weak and little minds, is an inexhaustible source of infidelity and scepticism, both political and religious; man is a being, circumscribed in his ideas, confined in his faculties, and limited in his attainments; endued by the provident hand of Nature with passions and with reason peculiarly adapted to the station he is destined to fulfil, the acquisition of happiness, by a proper employment of those invaluable gifts, depends upon himself: but the moment he forsakes his native sphere, overleaps the limits and breaks down the barriers assigned him by Providence, he meets the just punishment of his arrogance and presumption, in losing the substance while he grasps at the shadow.

I shall probably be asked--Is *improvement* to be rejected because *perfection* cannot be attained? Certainly not; it constitutes the peculiar excellence of our admirable constitution, that it affords a remedy for every evil, redress for every grievance; but those remedies and that redress must be sought for in a legal and constitutional manner; by the PEOPLE through the medium of their REPRESENTATIVES, ever attentive to their interest, and anxious for their welfare. Conscious that this certain mode of obtaining redress for all real injuries subsisted, your enemies have artfully endeavoured to inspire you with a mistrust of your representatives, and all the wicked arts of calumny, supported by the most miserable sophistry, have been exerted, to render them contemptible in your eyes. I will not deny the existence of some inequality in our system of representation, but that such inequality has been productive of no evil effects, that it has not led, in the most remote degree, to the oppression of the people, the non-existence of such oppression most irrefragably proves. The most
suble

subtle logic, the most pompous arguments must sink before the evidence of facts, and to the experience of many years, I appeal, for the truth of this assertion---That however a spirit of party may occasionally be displayed in the deliberations of that august body, in all grand questions of national importance, in all questions, in which the welfare and happiness of the people are involved, the parliament, guided by the true principles of justice, evince a noble and disinterested spirit, superior to all private feuds and personal animosities, and discharge, with religious scrupulosity, the supreme functions with which they are entrusted by the people. The disposition of parliament to administer justice with spirit and impartiality being admitted, their *ability* cannot possibly be questioned. Moderate writers have declared their power to be *absolute and without controul*, and some have even ventured to assign them the attribute of *omnipotence**.

But

* Though I admit the policy of a wise and temperate reform in parliament, I am decidedly of opinion that any such attempt, at the present crisis, would lead to the most dangerous consequences. "If a measure be just in itself, no time can be improper for enforcing it," and "Truth is never out of season," are favourite affirmations with superficial minds, and have a wonderful effect on the thoughtless and ignorant, who are more apt to be captivated by sound, than to be moved by sense. But the least reflection will suffice to prove, that such affirmations—like most of the abstract propositions of this *philosophising* age—are extremely fallacious, and, when applied as a rule of conduct in life, either absolutely impracticable or highly pernicious. In the present rage for despising the wisdom of *past* times, the quotation of an *old* proverb may possibly subject me to the imputation of *blasphemy*; but as I am no convert to modern *omniscience*, I will even venture to assert, that the saying—"Truth is not to be spoken at all times," is not more ancient than wise. There are few men in an active sphere of life, who are not occasionally compelled to associate with many, whose principles they despise, and whose conduct

But the men, who are thus studious to point out defects in our present constitution, are not actuated by a wish that you should endeavour to improve and to meliorate it: Confusion, not order, destruction, not reform is the object of their desires, and the end of their proceedings. That they wish to promote the total annihilation of our present government is evident from their own impudent assertions*. Their sentiments are congenial with those of Rabaud

duet they reprobate: Such an intercourse is necessary for the purposes of society, and yet it can only be maintained by a certain degree of reserve or dissimulation; for were those men to act up to the principle of always speaking the truth, the expression of their contempt, and the avowal of their reprobation, would not only break off the intercourse, but excite between them, a spirit of malice hatred and revenge, destructive of all peace and social order. The exemplification of this truth, alike applicable to public and private affairs, is within the scope of every man's daily observation.

In reply to the first affirmation, it may be observed, by way of analogy, that there are many medicines, which, administered in a particular stage of a disorder operate as specifick remedies, but, taken at a different period, have a fatal tendency. Thus, political affairs when the minds of the people are in a state of fermentation, it is no season for reform; and as no public inconvenience has hitherto ensued from the present system of representation, the protraction of a reform till a more favourable period, cannot possibly be productive of any evil effects.

With regard to the propagators of such affirmations as those I have noticed, I shall only observe—" Their affirmations are to us no axioms; we esteem thereof as things unsaid, and account them but in list of nothing."

Brown's Vulgar Errors.

* It is truly curious to observe the circumstances which have marked the conduct of the club, distinguished by the appellation of "*the Society for Constitutional Information*." Though, professedly formed for the laudable purpose of obtaining information concerning the constitution of this country, it passed a formal vote of thanks, published in all the papers, to the author of a pamphlet in which it is boldly and unequivocally asserted that *we have no Constitution at all*. But inconsistency is not the that

Rabaud de St. Etienne, a dissenting minister, member of the first National Assembly, and of the present National Convention of France, who, in a work quoted by M. de Calonne, observes—"all the existing establishments—are so many sources of misery to the people! we must renovate that people, if we wish to promote its happiness: we must change its ideas—we must change its manners—we must change men—we must change things—we must change words—we must *destroy every thing*, yes, *destroy every thing*, since every thing is to be created anew." How far, this principle of *universal destruction* may accord with the precepts of the Gospel I leave to divines to determine; but that it will excite the abhorrence of the people of England, as an Englishman, I am proud to affirm.

The science of government, of all sciences the most difficult of attainment, has attracted the attention, and constituted the study of men, the wisest and most enlightened in every age; who have invariably admitted the lawful existence of different forms of government, as influenced by the various considera-

only nor the heaviest charge I have to prefer against this dangerous society: It has been reported, and I have particular reasons for believing the report to be true, that the members of the society have taken uncommon pains to circulate, at a considerable expence to themselves, Pain's impudent and seditious Libel; that three hundred thousand copies of that publication have been circulated by their means; that in order to facilitate the sale and encrease the circulation they tempted the Booksellers by an extraordinary profit of cent per cent, having sold them at three-pence each copy to the trade who retailed them at six-pence; and, lastly that, *since the proclamation*, they have been studious to augment the sale, and have given orders to one printer alone to print one hundred thousand copies. Unless the members stand forward and publicly confute this charge, the truth of it must be deemed established, and they will henceforth be considered as associating for the purpose of subverting the laws, and overturning the constitution of their country.

tions of climate, manners, situation and extent of country. It has ever been allowed that these considerations should be maturely weighed by all who attempt the formation of any system of government; in the accomplishment of so difficult a task experience should be called in aid of application, and excellence be sought for in comparison; since it has always been supposed that by comparing different forms of government, and the different motives which superinduced their establishment, the wisdom requisite for rejecting what is bad and retaining what is good can alone be acquired. But it was reserved for the present age, to behold a Man, destitute of every endowment to qualify him for so arduous an enterprize, arrogantly start up, and assume the extraordinary privilege of dictating to nations, prescribing to the different kingdoms of the earth, the same Code of Laws, and the same form of government. Posterity will naturally enquire—nor would the enquiry misbecome the *people of England*—*who* and *what* was this man that arrogated to himself the presumptuous right of rejecting the united wisdom of ages, and supposed himself born to enlighten mankind? How great will be their surprize, when informed that he was not only an obscure but *contemptible* individual, who had collected his ideas of *liberty* from the inferior department of an *Excise-office*; his principles of *patriotism* from a *rebel-congress*, and his opinions of *royalty* from a *Republican Senate*. Yes, my countrymen, you would do well to investigate the character of this incendiary, who, while he insolently arraigns the conduct of his *SUPERIORS*, strives to defraud you of your birthright, by deluding you into the resignation of a certain good for a precarious advantage: from the tenor of his past life you will be enabled to form some probable conjectures with
respect

respect to his present conduct, and his future designs.

Thomas Pain (alias Paine) is the son of a Stay-maker, who formerly resided at Thetford in the County of Norfolk. Being destined to follow the trade of his father, he was sent to the Free-school at Thetford, where he learned to read, write and cast accompts, and at the age of thirteen having acquired as much learning as was deemed requisite for a Stay-maker, he left school, and continued to work with his father and a relation in the same way of business, till he had completed his twentieth year, when he repaired to London, and from thence to Dover, where, in 1758, he was hired, as a journeyman, by a Stay-maker, of the name of Grace. Having obtained ten pounds from his master, under pretence, it is said, of marrying his sister, he went to Sandwich to work for *himself*. It must be observed, Thomas neither married the lady nor repaid the loan.

At Sandwich the profits of his trade proving insufficient to maintain him, he occasionally exercised the occupation of an independent preacher; and, in the view to *better* his circumstances, he married, in 1759, Mary Lambert, a servant to a woollen draper in the town. Hoping, probably, to extend his business by commencing housekeeper, he procured credit for furniture, of a Mr. Rutter, a broker at Sandwich; but all schemes failing and having, from his ill usage of his wife, who is represented as a deserving young woman, become an object of general detestation to the inhabitants, he embarked on board a vessel, one *Sunday*, and sailing to Margate, there sold by auction the furniture he had obtained on credit from the broker at Sandwich. Had the law, in this instance, been suffered to take its course, it is possible Thomas

Pain might have been conveyed to America, at the expence of government.

Having procured money by the sale of another man's goods, he hastened to London; but whether his *wife* died on the road, or whether she be still alive, remains yet to be proved. In 1762 the champion of freedom was content to accept, *for a Salary*, the only office which favours of despotism in the English constitution, that of an *Exciseman*; and he followed this avocation, first at Grantham, and then at Alford, till August, 1765, when he was dismissed with ignominy. Thomas was now reduced to a state of extreme wretchedness; he was destitute of every necessary of life; and was compelled to subsist on charity. The same person who relieved his wants, probably procured his restoration to *office* in July 1766: but though replaced on the list of *Excisemen*, he had no present employment, and therefore engaged himself, as an English Usher, to a school-master in Lemon-street, at a salary of twenty-five pounds a year. His tyrannical disposition having disgusted both master and boys, he left this place, at the expiration of six months, and remained with another school-master at Kensington, three months longer, when he betook himself to the profession of an itinerant preacher, occasionally exhibiting his talents in Moorfields and other places of popular resort.

In March, 1768, he was sent, in the capacity of an *Exciseman*, to Lewes in Suffex, and took lodgings at the house of a Mr. Ollive, a Tobacconist, where he lived till the death of that trader, (in July 1769) when his integrity being suspected, from an attempt to retain some of the effects of the deceased, he was turned out of the house by Mr. Atterfol the executor. In the following year, however, having found means to insinuate himself into the good graces of the

the widow, he procured his recal and opened the shop, in his own name, as a grocer, and, in his own behalf—though still an *Exciseman*—continued to work the tobacco-mills of Ollive.

In 1771, Miss Elizabeth Ollive, unawed by the representations, and regardless of the remonstrances, of her friends, gave her hand to Thomas. This union was marked by two particular circumstances: Thomas, when he obtained the marriage-licence, swore that he was a *Bachelor*, though he had been married before: he also signed his name to the entry on the register which represented him as a *Bachelor*: but whether by these trifling deviations from truth, he subjected himself, in the first instance, to the punishment annexed by the law to the crime of *Perjury*, and, in the second, to the penalties of the marriage-act, by which any person, making a false entry on the register, is declared guilty of *Felony*, *without benefit of Clergy*, I must leave it to lawyers to determine. Be that as it may, the marriage was productive of no happiness to the bride, and of little profit to the groom: Such was the management, or such the extravagance of *honest* Thomas, that the joint profits of a smuggler and exciseman proved inadequate to save him from the shame and ruin of bankruptcy: in April 1774, having made over the whole of his property to one creditor, by which transaction the rest were defrauded of their due, his effects were advertised for sale, and “ a horse tobacco and snuff-mill, with
“ all the utensils for cutting of tobacco and grind-
“ ding of snuff” being inserted in the catalogue, and public advertisements, his mal practices became notorious and an investigation being made into his conduct, he was again dismissed with ignominy from the office of an exciseman.

Thomas's second wife experienced no better treatment

ment from him than his first had done ; his temper, brutal and ferocious, could neither be softened by meekness nor restrained by submission ; at length, the poor woman, tired out by repeated acts of cruelty and continued beatings, declared, that though she had cohabited with her husband for three years and a half, *their marriage had never been consummated.* Thomas, with philosophic coolness, observed “ that he married for prudential reasons, and abstained “ for prudential reasons :” in other words, that he married for profit and did not chuse to have a family whom he had not industry to maintain : his conduct, which tended to violate the laws of God and man, occasioned a separation that took place, on the twenty fourth of May, 1774 ; by the articles whereof the wife engaged to pay her husband thirty-five pounds, who on his part resigned all claim to any future property she might acquire. Thomas, however, in the hope, probably, of obtaining more money, attempted to invalidate this agreement ; but, on the fourth of June, new articles of separation were drawn up and signed*.

In September, 1774, having obtained a recommendation to Dr. Franklin, he embarked for America, which had already afforded a refuge to many *worthy* citizens of England. Neglected by the Doctor who, we are told, considered him *as a bad character*, he engaged himself as a shopman to a book-

* By a letter, written in July 1774, from Pain's mother to his wife, it appears that Thomas behaved with great ingratitude to his parents, and that he paid no greater attention to the duties of a son, than to those of a husband. Old Mrs. Pain, in this letter, notices a report, originating with the excise-office, of his having secreted thirty pounds which had been entrusted to his care by the body of excisemen, for the purpose of conducting a petition for an increase of salary ! —

seller in Philadelphia; and passed a few months in the honest occupation of retailing penny-pamphlets, and carrying out parcels. He soon, however, enlisted under the banners of rebellion, and in January, 1776, published COMMON-SENSE.

There is an article of the new French constitution, (which Thomas has had the impudence to hold up as a pattern for Englishmen to imitate) by which any Frenchman who serves the enemies of his country is sentenced to lose his life. Now, whatever difference of opinion may be entertained on the *ground of Revolt* in America, no one will deny that the Americans were, at this time, the *enemies of England*, and that Thomas Pain, (with grief I speak it) was an *Englishman*:—and a plain man will be apt to draw this inference that Thomas according to his own principles (putting the laws of England entirely out of the question) deserved to be hanged, as a Traitor.

The *inflammatory* talents of Thomas at length recommended him to the notice of Congress; and, in 1777, he was appointed to the office of *Secretary to the Committee of foreign affairs*. His “insolence of office” exposed him to the resentment of Robert Morris, the American financier, and his infidelity, in betraying his official information, produced a remonstrance from the *Sieur Gerard*, the French envoy, and occasioned on the eighth of January, 1779, his *forced* resignation of a post, which, from so flagrant a breach of trust, he was deemed unworthy to hold.

Thomas was now reduced once more to feel the bitterness of want, and to lament that *inequality*, which allowed one man to enjoy the luxuries, of wealth, while another was involved in the miseries of poverty. After much tedious solicitation for a reward of his *important* and *disinterested* services, he at length obtained from the assembly of Pennsylvania, a
sum

sum of money equivalent to a *Pension* of eighteen pounds sterling. On the restoration of peace, independence, the grand bone of contention, being obtained, it might naturally be supposed that Thomas would remain in America, to enjoy the fruits of those victories which he ascribed, in a great measure, to the wonderful effects of his own *patriotic* productions : But, unfortunately for him, all the principles he had broached were despised by the Congress, and Washington, the dictator of America, rejecting the nonsense of COMMON SENSE, made the following declaration, as the result of the united wisdom of the new world, which, after mature deliberation, had discovered what an English school-boy at sixteen could have taught them, “ it is obviously impracticable
 “ in the federal government of these states, to secure all the rights of independent sovereignty to
 “ each, and yet to provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals, entering into society, *must*
 “ give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The
 “ magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on
 “ situation and circumstance, as on the object to be
 “ obtained.” As this was too rational for Thomas, who could only hope to thrive in the midst of anarchy, and as he foresaw that a constitution would, notwithstanding his eloquence, be established in America, resembling, as nearly as circumstances would admit, the constitution of England; he took shipping for France, and after a short stay in that country, arrived in London, in September, 1787.

Thomas had brought over with him the *model* of a *bridge*; as it was to be made of iron he went into Yorkshire to superintend the operation of casting, the expence of which he was enabled to defray by an American merchant, whose assignees afterwards arrested Pain, in October, 1789, for six hundred

dred and twenty pounds. After a confinement of three weeks he procured bail, and on the payment of four hundred and sixty pounds, which he had at length received from America, and on giving his note for the remainder, he was left penniless to procure a subsistence as he could. He then hastened to France, at that time in a state of confusion, and having probably settled his plan with the incendiaries in that distracted country, he returned to England in November 1790, and, in order to revenge himself for the repeated disgraces he had suffered here, immediately set to work on his curious performance of *The Rights of Man* *.

Such is Thomas Pain!—And let me now ask my countrymen, whether any man who considers honesty as a duty and patriotism as a virtue, would be seen to associate with him? Whether in his feeble, though daring, attempts to overturn our constitution, any man can seriously believe that he has been actuated by just and laudable motives? Whether the bold and arrogant assertions of one who, on important occasions, has displayed so shameful a disregard to truth, are deserving of the smallest credit? Were any

* The facts contained in this sketch of Pain's life, have been taken from the publication of Mr. Oldys, published by Stockdale, in which not only the infamy of that incendiary's conduct, but the gross folly and absurdity of many of his doctrines, are exposed with much good sense, and considerable acuteness.

The Monthly Reviewers, whose opinions deserve all the respect which *learning* and *abilities* are entitled to, have said—(vol. 9, p. 141, of the New Series)—“*We place no confidence in an immoral man, who defends the cause of Liberty.*”—Immorality, according to Johnson's definition of the term, means *dishonesty*; *want of virtue*; I conceive, therefore, that the Reviewers, must either avow their disbelief of the facts advanced by Pain's biographer (which facts appear to me to be established beyond the reach of confutation) or declare Thomas to be unworthy of confidence.

D

person

person to propose to me to pull down a good, solid and well-constructed mansion, adapted to every purpose of convenient and useful accommodation, assuring me that the old materials would not only suffice to erect a more spacious, a more beautiful and a more durable structure, but would put a considerable sum of money into my pocket, besides, should I not naturally enquire into the character of this man before I acceded to such an extraordinary proposal; and if I found him either a fool or a rogue should I not be mad to follow his advice? *—"Put no trust," says Rousseau—"in those cosmopolites, who in their writings seek for duties at a distance, while they neglect to perform those which are their immediate concern. A philosopher of this kind loves the Tartars, by way of excuse for hating his neighbours."

That Thomas has ever been actuated by the most implacable hatred and enmity, not merely to the king and government, but to the *People* of Great Britain, the following quotations from his early publications most unequivocally prove.

"Men of passive tempers," he says to the Americans, "look somewhat lightly over the offences of Britain, still hoping for the best, and are apt to call out, Come, come, we shall be friends again for all this. But let us examine the passions and feelings of mankind; bring the doctrine of reconciliation to the touchstone of nature, and then tell me whether you can hereafter love, honour, and faithfully serve the power that hath carried fire and sword

† Thomas himself has said—"Politics and *self-interest* have been so uniformly connected, that the world, from being so often deceived, has a right to be suspicious of public characters." *Rights of Man*, Second Part, p. 92, note.

"into

“ into your land*.”—To talk of friendship with
 “ those in whom our reason forbids us to have faith,
 “ and our affections wounded through a thousand
 “ pores instruct us to *detest*, is madness and folly :—
 “ The last cord is now broken, the *people of England*
 “ are presenting addresses against us. There are in-
 “ juries which nature cannot forgive; she would
 “ cease to be nature if she did. As well can the
 “ lover forgive the ravisher of his mistress, as the
 “ continent of America forgive the *murderers of Bri-*
 “ *tain*. The Almighty hath implanted in us these
 “ unextinguishable feelings for good and wise pur-
 “ poses †.” Nor were these either temporary feel-
 ings excited by a recent sense of injury, or mere sug-
 gestions calculated to promote the declaration of in-
 dependency, but the real workings of the man’s
 mind, for the same rooted hatred to England—where
 he had experienced so many indignities, and commit-
 ted so many enormities—appears in his “ Letter to
 “ the Abbé Raynal,” written after an interval of three
 years, and after the independence of America had
 been declared; and has been lately repeated, avow-
 ed, and renewed by ostentatious republications in the
 very midst of us; nay it is, if possible, carried far-
 ther ‡. In his letter to Raynal, the inveterate and
 eternal hatred of this miscreant is justified upon the
 detestable qualities of the English people in general;
 and he very seriously invites all the world to unite
 with him in hate, and to join together to machinate
 the destruction of this odious nation. “ If”—says
 he—“ we take a view of the part Britain has acted,
 “ we shall find every thing which ought to make a

* Common Sense; p. 15 of the *sixpenny* edition.
 † Idem. p. 21. ‡ *Observations on the Rights of Man*,
 by Sir Brooke Boothby, p. 102.

“ nation blush ; the most vulgar abuse accompanied
 “ by that species of haughtiness which distinguishes
 “ a mob from a gentleman.” (Thomas’s definition
 of a *gentleman* would be truly curious) “ It was equal-
 “ ly from her manners as from her injustice that she
 “ lost her colonies *.” To the abbé’s admiration of
 England’s magnanimity in refusing the proffered me-
 diation of Spain, in 1779, he says—“ The rejection
 “ was not prompted by her fortitude but her vanity.
 “ Why did not the abbé rather dwell with pleasure
 “ on that greatness of character, that superiority of
 “ heart, which has marked the conduct of France
 “ in her conquests.” (Thomas, in his rage, forgot
 that France was at this time afflicted with “ The evil
 “ of Monarchy,” as he calls it, and that not of the
 best kind ; but the world will not forget that “ that
 “ greatness of character, that superiority of heart,”
 which he *then* so highly commended, was displayed
 by that very monarch whom he *now* contributes to
 persecute with all the malignant virulence of an illi-
 beral soul, exulting in the misfortunes of its superiors !)
 “ The confederates unite in a rival eminence in the
 “ treatment of their enemies. Spain, in her con-
 “ quest of Minorca and the Bahama Islands, con-
 “ firms this remark. America has been invariable
 “ in her lenity from the beginning of the war. It is
 “ England, only, who has been insolent and cruel †.
 “ A mind habituated to meanness and injustice com-
 “ mits them without reflection. For on what other
 “ ground than this can we account for the declara-
 “ tion of war against the Dutch ‡? When once the
 “ mind loses the sense of its own dignity, it loses
 “ likewise the ability of judging it in another ; and
 “ the American war has thrown Britain into such a

* Letter to the Abbé Raynal, p. 10. † Pages 62, 63. ‡ P. 69.

“ variety

“ variety of absurd situations, that arguing from
 “ herself, she sees not in what conduct national digni-
 “ ty consists in other countries. From Holland she
 “ expected duplicity and submission, and this mis-
 “ take arose from having acted in a number of in-
 “ stances, during the present war, the same charac-
 “ ter herself.” — “ To be allied to or connected with
 “ Britain seems to be an unsafe and *impolitic* situation.
 “ Holland and America are instances of the *reality* of
 “ this remark. Make these countries the allies of France
 “ and Spain, and Britain will court them with civi-
 “ lity and treat them with respect; make them her
 “ own allies, and she will insult and plunder them.
 “ In the first case she feels some apprehension of of-
 “ fending them because they have support at hand;
 “ in the latter these apprehensions do not exist *.—
 “ A total reformation is wanted in England—she
 “ wants an expanded mind †.—She has laboured to
 “ be wretched, and studied to be hated. France is
 “ as able to be superior to England in the extent of
 “ her navy as she is in the extent of her revenues and
 “ population, and England may lament the day when
 “ by her insolence and injustice she provoked in
 “ France a maritime disposition”—and then follows
 a detailed plan for *the annihilation of the British navy*
 —“ To conclude, if it may be said, that Britain has
 “ numerous enemies, it likewise proves she has given
 “ numerous offences. Insolence is sure to provoke
 “ hatred in a nation or an individual.” (Thomas
 Pain, then, has no objection to provoking hatred)
 “ The want of manners in the British court, even in
 “ its birth-days and new year’s odes, are calculated
 “ to infatuate the vulgar, and disgust the man of re-

* Letter to the Abbé Raynal, p. 71.

† P. 74.

“ finement”; and her former overbearing rudeness
 “ and insufferable injustice on the seas have made
 “ every commercial nation her foe. Her fleets were
 “ employed as engines of prey, and acted on the
 “ surface of the deep the character which the shark
 “ does under it.”—And he finally advises the powers
 at a general peace to allow her only a limited number
 of ships.

From this series of declarations of enmity and abhorrence, continued through a period of many years, and now confirmed by a new avowal, no doubt can, surely, remain in any man’s mind of the determined evil disposition of Thomas Paine respecting the British nation; nor consequently of the malevolent spirit by which he must be actuated in all his voluntary proceedings towards us. After all his plans for her destruction, and predictions of her fall, he sees her rise superior, in her relative situation as well as her internal prosperity, to what she was before. Like the Devil in Paradise, he turns aside with envy at the sight, and projects the destruction of this happiness, not only in the same spirit, but by the very means employed by Satan himself †—

* The refinement of Thomas Paine is like the sobriety of Lord G——y, the patriotism of Lord S——, and the piety of Parson H——. This insolent remark has extorted from the moderate pen of Sir B. Boothby, the following observations: “ This writer (Paine) has the natural eloquence of a night-cellar. He writes in defiance of grammar, as if syntax were an aristocratical invention; and with a disregard of decency worthy of his politics. There is a sort of monkey-like impudence, which is so gross, that the malice of it is lost in the buffoonery; of this kind, is his affectation of refined disgust at the vulgarity of the English court, in a writer whose merit, if he has any, consists in his vulgarity. p. 106. † Idem, p. 107.

—I will

—I will excite their minds
 With more desire to know, and to reject
 Envious commands, invented with design
 To keep *them* low, whom knowledge might exalt
 Equal with Gods: aspiring to be such
 THEY TASTE AND DIE. *Paradise Lost. Book 4*

I mean not to tire you by a recapitulation of all the abstract propositions contained in the "Rights of Man," a work marked by such gross folly and absurdity, that, but for the uncommon pains which, for the most diabolical purposes, have been taken to promote its circulation, must, long since, have been consigned to eternal oblivion. Of such a work it will suffice to notice the general tendency and leading principles. Its avowed object is the promotion of *Liberty* and *Equality*, and the means proposed for obtaining that object, the destruction of all existing establishments, moral, religious, and political. At a proposition thus monstrous Common Sense revolts, and humanity shudders.

In order to uphold this system of destruction, many bold and preposterous fictions are advanced, of which the following constitute the substance*.

That the living cannot be bound by laws made by the dead.—That all men being perfectly equal, every man has an equal right in every thing.—That every man in society retains the right of doing every thing that he is able to do; and acquires the right to call upon the general force to assist him in doing every thing that he is not able to do. But let us examine some few of the propositions by which these affirmations are supported.

* The critics, in reviewing Sir Brooke Boothby's pamphlet, have denied that these three propositions are affirmed by Pain in the sense affixed to them by Sir Brooke; but if the propositions that follow do not justify this explanation of them, to me, I confess, Pain is unintelligible.

" Every

“ Every age and generation ”—says Thomas—“ must be as free to act for itself IN ALL CASES, as the generation which preceded it.”—If you want an argument to maintain this proposition, you must not look for it in “ Rights of Man.” Affirmation requires nothing but assurance; proof demands something more. But no proof, in this instance, could possibly be adduced, since the proposition is only meant to affirm that the present generation is not bound by any laws which were enacted previous to its existence. The laws against *treason* were enacted long before the existence of Thomas Pain; according, therefore, to his own *disinterested* principle, they cannot extend to him. He spoke *feelingly* when he observed, that “ When we see age going to the work-house and youth to the gallows, something must be wrong in the system of government.” applying the “ argument to the man,” a mode of application of which he himself is particularly fond, we may conjecture that when he wrote this paragraph, he had the *Excise-Laws* and the *Marriage-Act* in his eye.

But, with regard to his propositions; if *age* imply, as, if it has any signification, it must imply, a certain given period, as fifty or an hundred years, the doctrine is monstrous and arbitrary. Every man who comes into the world, soon after the given period at which the age acts for itself, endures a bondage, from which his more lucky seniors are exempt; and supposing the period fifty years, if he die at forty-nine, he has passed his life in this bondage, because nature has not permitted him to see the propitious year of the renovation of freedom.—When, then, let me ask, does this right to act for one’s self accrue?—I am afterwards told, in every generation. But, in a society of no great extent, every passing hour sees one generation

ration vanish and another arise. Is it, then, the case that on my arrival at the age of discretion, which, in such a society, must happen to some man at every hour of the day, I have a right to reject those laws, to the framing of which, though *my father* may, I never have, consented? Or, "as man has no power after his death," does every decree die away as fate takes off, one by one, the senate by which it was enacted?

But, that we may not mistake the meaning of the former proposition, he proceeds to observe—"When man ceases to exist his power ceases with him. He has no longer any authority in directing who shall govern, or how government shall be organized, or how administered."

If a man's power cease with his existence, all regulation of property by bequest is an usurpation. If I acquire by my industry a considerable fortune, and have a son and a grandson, the former disposed to extravagance, I am not permitted, according to this system, to prevent my son from leaving my grandson to starve, by transmitting to him only a life interest in my estate: neither am I allowed to bind that son to pay my own debts out of the estate I bequeath him; nor to compel my executor to execute leases, to pay legacies, to do a hundred things, in short, which, by every rule of moral justice, as well as municipal law, I am entitled to do.

Nature, without, indeed, any great respect for the opinions of Thomas, has provided, that the weakness and dependence of childhood, with certain affections which she has, with the same want of politeness, implanted in our bosoms, to wit, filial and parental love, should, among various other causes, uphold the power of man beyond the grave: the laws of man, too, equally culpable, as to Thomas, have ratified the

“ Every age and generation ”—says Thomas—“ must be as free to ACT for itself IN ALL CASES, as the generation which preceded it.”—If you want an argument to maintain this proposition, you must not look for it in “ Rights of Man.” Affirmation requires nothing but assurance; proof demands something more. But no proof, in this instance, could possibly be adduced, since the proposition is only meant to affirm that the present generation is not bound by any laws which were enacted previous to its existence. The laws against *treason* were enacted long before the existence of Thomas Paine; according, therefore, to his own *disinterested* principle, they cannot extend to him. He spoke *feelingly* when he observed, that “ When we see age going to the work-house and youth to the gallows, something must be wrong in the system of government.” applying the “ argument to the man,” a mode of application of which he himself is particularly fond, we may conjecture that when he wrote this paragraph, he had the *Excise-Laws* and the *Marriage-Act* in his eye.

But, with regard to his propositions; if *age* imply, as, if it has any signification, it must imply, a certain given period, as fifty or an hundred years, the doctrine is monstrous and arbitrary. Every man who comes into the world, soon after the given period at which the age acts for itself, endures a bondage, from which his more lucky seniors are exempt; and supposing the period fifty years, if he die at forty-nine, he has passed his life in this bondage, because nature has not permitted him to see the propitious year of the renovation of freedom.—When, then, let me ask, does this right to act for one’s self accrue?—I am afterwards told, in every generation. But, in a society of no great extent, every passing hour sees one generation

ration vanish and another arise. Is it, then, the case that on my arrival at the age of discretion, which, in such a society, must happen to some man at every hour of the day, I have a right to reject those laws, to the framing of which, though *my father* may, *I* never have, consented? Or, “as man has no power after “his death,” does every decree die away as fate takes off, one by one, the senate by which it was enacted?

But, that we may not mistake the meaning of the former proposition, he proceeds to observe—“*When man ceases to exist his power ceases with him. He has no longer any authority in directing who shall govern, or how government shall be organized, or how administered.*”

If a man's power cease with his existence, all regulation of property by bequest is an usurpation. If I acquire by my industry a considerable fortune, and have a son and a grandson, the former disposed to extravagance, I am not permitted, according to this system, to prevent my son from leaving my grandson to starve, by transmitting to him only a life interest in my estate: neither am I allowed to bind that son to pay my own debts out of the estate I bequeath him; nor to compel my executor to execute leases, to pay legacies, to do a hundred things, in short, which, by every rule of moral justice, as well as municipal law, I am entitled to do.

Nature, without, indeed, any great respect for the opinions of Thomas, has provided, that the weakness and dependence of childhood, with certain affections which she has, with the same want of politeness, implanted in our bosoms, to wit, filial and parental love, should, among various other causes, uphold the power of man beyond the grave: the laws of man, too, equally culpable, as to Thomas, have ratified the

laws of nature, and, by various modes, either of limiting the descent of property themselves, or authorizing parents to limit it, have extended the power of man beyond the period of his existence.

But if we admit that a man's power die with him, no man is at this day bound by any moral obligation to pay obedience to any law made before his birth, but may disobey and resist all such laws as far as he is able. Having thus relieved our minds from all moral obligation of obedience to the laws and institutions of our forefathers, the pious author proceeds to establish another fundamental principle of destruction: viz. "*The illuminating and divine principle of the equality of man.*" Not that political equality which distinguishes the freeman from the slave, but absolute and positive equality, received immediately from God, in the "*same manner as if posterity had been continued by creation instead of generation,*" whence, as has justly been observed, it follows as a necessary consequence, that society cannot give nor any man possess any right to appropriate to his own use any part of the common benefits of nature, more than his necessities immediately require, so as to exclude from them any other men, who have all an equal right with himself. In order to reduce this principle to practice, every man ought to resign all he possesses, and put all his property into one common stock-purse, whence it might be distributed in *equal* parts to all the different members of the community: the indolent and the industrious; the lazy and the laborious; the extravagant and the frugal; the bad and the good, would, then be placed on one common level, and all the *partialities* of *Nature*, displayed in her *unjust* distinctions, be effectually remedied. What an admirable plan of *demolition*! But Thomas's plan for rebuilding

building the fabric he thus seeks to demolish, is equally worthy of admiration!

1. *Man—he says—did not enter into society to have fewer rights than he had before. Every civil right has for its foundation some natural right pre-existing in the individual, but to the enjoyment of which his individual power is not, in all cases, sufficiently complete. Every civil right is a natural right exchanged.*

If this be true, man does not associate, or enter into society, for the purpose of imposing a restraint on his natural appetites and passions, but in order to facilitate the gratification of those appetites and passions, in other words, that he may “take the strong arm of society. in addition to his own, whenever his powers for their enjoyment are defective in the individual.” If this be not moral, it is, at least consistent.

2. *The natural rights which he retains are all those in which the power to execute is as perfect in the individual as the right itself.*

But it has already been shewn that according to the “divine principle of the equal rights of man,” no individual can have a right to possess any thing to the exclusion of others; and that every man has a right by his own force, and the assistance of society, if necessary, to resist such exclusion; and the enjoyment of a beautiful female, or any other of the goods of fortune being among these natural rights, in which the power to execute is as perfect as the right itself: it follows that those acts which have hitherto been injuriously distinguished, and unjustly punished, under the names of rape, robbery, burglary, and assassination, are in reality no more than civil rights founded on natural rights pre-existing in the individual. Rights which the power produced from the aggregate of

of natural rights imperfect in the individual, cannot be applied to invade †.

Of such materials is the visionary fabric of this incendiary composed! The absurdity of his principles being proved, whatever systems he may have built on those principles must fall to the ground. Pain pronounced his own condemnation, when he said, "Principles must stand on their own merits, and if they are good, they certainly will ‡."

Had Pain confined himself to a display of his folly alone, silent contempt would have been his portion; but there is an evident malignity of design visible throughout his works, that rouses our utmost indignation.—He talks much about rights, but little about duties. Whatever we have been accustomed to hold sacred, he vilifies or derides. The fear of God—allegiance to kings—affection for parliaments—duty to magistrates—reverence for the clergy—and respect for nobility—are, with him, evils, flowing from the contaminated source of monarchical governments. If these be evils, I am proud to say, that every true Englishman not only glories in their existence, but will contribute, with his life and fortune, to promote such efforts as are best calculated to ensure their continuance. The fact is, that, without intending it, Thomas has pronounced the greatest eulogy on monarchical governments, that its firmest advocates could desire;—Establishments which produce such effects must secure the support of every man of honour and honesty.

None but a brain the most disordered, or a mind the most depraved, could have engendered the preposterous idea, that, by softening the heart of man, in

† Observations on Paine, by Sir B. B.

‡ Preface to the Second Part of the "Rights of Man."

favour of the relative duties of society, you harden it towards the Creator himself* ; it is, in my opinion, by considering those duties and our state of dependence on them, that we attain to that humility of mind, with which reason as well as religion teaches us we ought to approach a power between whom and ourselves the distance is infinite.

The humble spirit of christianity and the moral it inculcates are seldom quoted by authors who contend for those aerial rights which are inconsistent with either, or one might argue, from those neglected writings, *The Scriptures*, that we are not thrown very far out of the line of our duty to God, by doing honour to the king†.

The dissolution of every moral and social tie would be the natural consequence of the principles which this man labours to enforce. "*The world is as new—he tells us—to every child born, as to the first man existing, and his natural right in it is of the same kind.*" But, if every child, that is born has the same right as the first man existing—if his right be the same as if he were *created* instead of *generated*, who shall say he is wrong if he return the blow which the father who has fostered and protected gives him in the hour of correction?—Yet God, nature, and the ties of generation, which are here set at nought, hold such an act in abhorrence.

It is curious to observe with what awkward art Pain proceeds in his attempts to overthrow the government of a country that gave him birth. Aware of the opposition he must necessarily experience, and of the support he must necessarily require, in the course

* Pain calls the evils, above specified, *fear of God, &c. &c.* "*A wilderness of turnpike gates placed between man and his Maker.*"

† "*Fear God!—Honour the king*"—says St. Peter.

of so arduous an enterprize, he seeks to quiet the fears of the wealthy, and to inflame the passions of the poor; to the merchant, he declares himself an advocate for commerce; to the stock-holder he talks of the injustice and impolicy of extinguishing the national debt; to the soldier he proposes an encrease of pay; and to the workman an encrease of wages:—But his malevolence appears in spite of all his efforts to conceal it; and where he professes attachment in one place he displays his hatred in twenty.

That all violent convulsions in a state, where commerce has already attained to such a height as it has done in England, must operate as a check to commerce is manifest: And that the adoption of Pain's principles by a majority of the nation would lead to such convulsions no one can deny. With regard to the national debt, his acknowledgment of the injustice of extinction is counteracted by his affirmation that the funds are a proper object of taxation. Though he professes a regard for the interest of the soldier, yet he only proposes to encrease his pay, twenty-six shillings a year; while his partiality to his former profession—though more nearly allied to despotism than any office in the state—leads him to insist on an addition of *twenty pounds* a year to the salary of an *Exciseman*. He expatiates on the importance of education, but he will only allow *twenty pounds* a year to a school-mistress while his favourite exciseman is to have *seventy* forsooth!

But with respect to the soldiers and workmen some farther observations are necessary. He had seen in what manner the first National Assembly of France had seduced the troops, and ignorant of the difference between the French and English troops, he hoped by the employment of the same means to produce

duce the same effect here. But Pain knew little of the soul of an English soldier—who, in his allegiance to his sovereign and his duty to his country, scorns to be actuated by the paltry consideration of *pay*! *His bosom owns a nobler impulse;—honour: His services claim a nobler reward; the applause of his country.* True to those principles, by which the soldiers of England have been ever distinguished, they will, I am convinced, when called, by the laws of their country, to act, display that steady and determined courage which no dangers can appal;—whether opposed to domestic traitors, or foreign enemies, whether employed in suppressing tumults or repelling invasions.—To suspect their fidelity would be to injure their honour—and the honour of a soldier is sacred.—In England, though every citizen be not a soldier every soldier is a citizen, and a *privileged* citizen too. All military men, who have been in the king's service, are at liberty to use any trade or occupation they are fit for, in any town in the kingdom (except the two universities), notwithstanding any statutes, custom or charter to the contrary*.—In some other cases also, soldiers are placed, by the laws, in a much better condition than any other subjects.

The endeavour to inflame the minds of the workmen is one of the most malignant of Pain's daring attempts; and there is no set of men, whose indignation it ought to excite in a greater degree than that of the very persons whom it is calculated to mislead. After stating that there are several laws in existence for the regulation and limitation of workmen's wages, this dangerous incendiary proceeds thus—*Why not leave them as free to make their own*

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. 4, p. 416.

“bargains,

“ *bargains as the law-makers are to let their farms*
 “ *and houses? Personal labour is all the property they*
 “ *have. Why is that little and the little freedom they*
 “ *enjoy to be infringed?* The assertions implied in
 these questions, are so many palpable and malicious
 falsehoods. A workman is as free to make his own
 bargain as a landholder:—for though the law pre-
 scribes no particular price to a farm, yet if a land-
 lord ask more than is reasonable certain it is nobody
 will give it him, and he must either keep it in his
 own hands, or else content himself with the same
 rent as is paid to his neighbours—in which case cus-
 tom has the same effect as law. If it be a house, in-
 stead of a farm, the case is still stronger, for he must
 either let it at the usual price, or submit to a stand-
 ing expence, and an encreasing loss.—Labour is not
 property, but the means of acquiring property. The
 labour of a workman is *not infringed*; they enjoy as
 much freedom as any other description of subjects;
 and that freedom is *not infringed*.—But there is no
 kind of analogy between the two cases.—For whe-
 ther a landholder let his farm to another or till it
 himself it is of no consequence to the community.
 The land is sure to be cultivated and the produce put
 in circulation: But if workmen refuse to work they not
 only suffer themselves but the public suffer too. Hence
 the necessity of preventing combinations for raising the
 price of workmanship, and regulations for that purpose
 have been adopted in every well-regulated government,
 both ancient and modern. But so far from operating as
 an infringement on their liberty, the workmen them-
 selves feel the good effects of those laws as much as
 any other subjects: Admit, for a moment, that no
 such laws existed, and that every workman *was free*
to make his own bargain: What would be the conse-
 quence? The journeyman shoemaker, would say “ I
 will

will have a guinea for making a pair of shoes ;" the taylor, " I will have two guineas for making a coat, a guinea for a waistcoat, and the same for breeches ;" the stocking-weaver would demand half a guinea for weaving a pair of stockings ; at the linen-manufactories the wages would be encreased in proportion, the journeyman butcher would expect a similar augmentation of pay ; and the brewer would not be contented with less.—So that every article of dress or consumption would be raised to such a price, that the shoemaker would find his guinea go no farther than his two or three shillings go now ; and no workman would be one farthing richer.—And all this Pain must have been aware of—unless we suppose him a downright Idiot—but so that he could excite a spirit of discontent and sedition, he cared not whom he deceived, or whom he exposed : if his scheme succeeded he would profit by the plunder ; if it failed he would leave those whom he had misled to abide the consequence of their folly.—The will, in such cases, must be taken for the deed, and the *workmen* have to thank him for projecting their ruin.

The same malevolence, the same anxiety to inflame, and the same false statements are observable in some other observations of this *liberty-boy*. He states (p. 101.) that—" Before the coming of the Hanoverians." (*as if the taxes had been imported from Hanover*) " The taxes were divided in nearly equal proportions between the land and articles of consumption, the land bearing rather the largest share : but since that æra, nearly thirteen millions annually of new taxes have been thrown upon consumption." This statement is exaggerated, but admitting it to be just, what does it prove ? It proves what must afford the most heartfelt satisfaction to every

friend of this country; viz—that the riches of the nation have, during that period, so much encreased, as greatly to exceed the landed property; and that it was, therefore, necessary to lay the encreased taxes upon the encreased riches, when the land, which is a fixed property, can only support a fixed and certain charge.—The only subject for enquiry, here, is, whether those taxes are unjustly laid? Thomas maintains that they are, and, with his usual candour, adduces this one fact in proof of his assertion.—“Several of the most heavy and productive taxes.”—he says, though he attempts to produce but *one* example—“are so contrived as to give an exemption to this pillar (the House of Lords), thus standing in its own defence. *The tax upon beer brewed for sale does not affect the aristocracy, who brew their own beer free of this duty.*—This wicked incendiary, no doubt, exulted in the strength of his own ingenuity when he had finished this sentence, which is equally marked by falshood and malevolence. He knew that nothing was more likely to inflame the common people, than to be told that the Lords had made a law, by which they could drink their beer a half-penny a pot cheaper than them; and he therefore resolved at all events to hazard the assertion. But the fact is that the right of brewing beer duty free, is not only not confined to the House of Lords, but is right possessed and exercised by every house-keeper in England, out of London; and in London, it is a notorious, that none of the nobility brew their own beer: What is drunk by their servants, or by their tradesmen, and labourers, and workmen of all kinds, who are fed with their money, pay the very same duties which are paid by the people in general; and, in the country, the *poorest house-keepers*, brew their little cask of ale against Christmas, or a christening,

as

as free from duty as any lord in the land. In his statement too of the gross produce of this tax, he commits a voluntary error, for having been himself an exciseman, he must know that a very considerable abatement is to be made for drawbacks and allowances; but it was his object to swell the amount as offensively as possible, and truth could not be expected from a man who had sworn he was a *bachelor* after he had been married.

The facts regarding his statement of the taxes, as generally applied, are, indeed, to a surprizing degree, the contrary of what is here so wickedly suggested. Where the taxes are unequal, the inequality, as it ought to do, presses upon the higher ranks. The house-tax, the window-tax, the servants-tax, the coach-tax, the duties on wine, the tax on post-horses, and many others, fall almost exclusively upon the rich; and the greater proportion of the taxes upon all objects of immediate consumption is, directly or indirectly, ultimately paid by them.

The proposal which our dear Thomas—says the excellent author whom I have so frequently had occasion to quote—has reserved for us, as his last best gift, is *to render the government insolvent for the purpose of taking it into our own hands*, and he shews us, from the example of France, how easily this may be accomplished. “If any credit is given”—he says—“it is to the disposition of the people to pay the tax, and not to the government which lays it on; when this disposition expires, what is supposed to be the credit of the government expires with it. The instance of France, under the former government, shews that it is impossible to compel the payment of taxes by force, when a whole nation is determined to stand upon its ground.” That there is no compelling a *whole* nation is clear
F 2 because

because the part that must be employed to compel the rest is included in the whole ; but it is also clear ; that where the payment of taxes cannot be compelled, contrary to the general disposition of the people, there will be no taxes at all, for a disposition in the people to pay taxes never can exist any where. If that which never existed can be said to expire, the disposition to pay taxes has expired in France, because the power to compel the payment of them has expired ; and not only the credit of the government but THE CREDIT OF THE NATION has expired also. Ruin and bankruptcy have been and must ever be the consequence. to ruin and bankruptcy this man calmly invites us. The wretch who, with false signals, directs the vessel on shore that he may plunder the wreck, has at least the plea of interest for his wickedness, but to love unprofitable mischief, to promote destruction for the mere pleasure of contemplating the sufferings of men, is a depravity for which there is no natural source in the human mind ; a wish to see millions reduced at once to all the horrors of beggary and despair, that a bankruptcy in the English funds must occasion, should seem only to belong to what we are taught to believe of the Devil himself †.

After noticing two other passages, I shall close my strictures on that compound of wickedness and folly yclept "Rights of Man." Page 129, we are told that every person in England, male and female, pays from their birth, two pounds eleven shillings and sixpence a year in taxes. But how is this curious calculation made?—He takes care to conceal the operation that his readers of the poorer class may only have before their eyes the immediate object of the taxes,

† Sir Brooke Boothby.

which

which he tells them, (a *most malicious falsehood*, by the bye) amount to one fourth of their yearly earnings. It is impossible however to mistake the mode of calculation he has chosen to adopt; viz. by taking the whole amount of the taxes, and dividing the sum *equally*, between every individual in the kingdom, rich and poor. For example; estimating the number of inhabitants at seven millions, and admitting that each person paid two pounds eleven shillings, and sixpence, the amount of their united contributions, would be eighteen millions and twenty five thousand pounds. I mean not this as an exact calculation of the number of inhabitants or the produce of the taxes; but I only make it to shew the mode of calculation adopted by Pain, who meant to deceive the poor by inducing them to believe that each man, woman and child paid in taxes two pounds eleven shillings and sixpence a year, in which case the Peasant would pay as much as the Peer. But we have already shown that many of the taxes fall, almost exclusively, on the rich; and that the far greater proportion of the rest is ultimately paid by that description of persons.

That his meaning may not be mistaken, he makes this false calculation the basis of an argument which tends to prove that, the poor are entitled, at a certain age, to a stipulated annuity—and, that such support "Is not of the nature of a *charity*, but of a *right*." In this part he is perfectly explicit, for he says, that every poor person pays two pounds eleven shillings and sixpence a year in taxes, "consequently, at the end of fifty years, he has paid one hundred and twenty-eight pounds fifteen shillings, and at sixty, one hundred and fifty-four pounds ten shillings." But all this he knew at the time to be *false*. Such a malicious attempt to inflame the poor, an attempt
 which

which leads to the destruction of *gratitude* on the one hand, and of *benevolence* on the other, is perfectly consistent with the rest of his endeavours. But the poor man—like the soldier and the workman—will now perceive that Pain is his greatest enemy: for by confining the claims of the poor to their *right* to enforce them, he saps the very foundation of charity. If I say to another man “I demand ten pounds of you as my *right*,” the reply is naturally “Prove your right.” If I failed in my proof, I should go with a very ill grace to ask that as a *favour* which I had before claimed as a *right*; and certain it is, that the person on whom I had made the former claim, would be little disposed to grant my present request. Now, as he founds the claims of the poor to relief on the money they have *not* paid, such claims must necessarily fall to the ground. But fortunately for them, the poor have stronger claims; they have claims on the *humanity* of their fellow creatures, claims resulting from those social and moral ties which the principles of this incendiary tends to dissolve, and sanctioned and confirmed by those laws and establishments which his mischievous efforts are calculated to subvert and overthrow. It is certainly the duty of every society to maintain those who are unable to work, and to provide labour for those who can.

With regard to the taxes falling heaviest on the poor, as Pain falsely asserts, it will not be denied that the chief articles of consumption with them are meat, cheese, and bread, none of which pay any tax: and the minister has very properly lowered the duty on tea, of which a great quantity is consumed by the poor, and which may now be bought at a very reasonable price.

The following paragraph completes the picture of
malevolence

malevolence: "*The horrid scene that is now acting by the English government in the East Indies;*" (says Pain, p. 166) "*fit only to be told of Goths and Vandals, who, destitute of principle, robbed and tortured the world they were incapable of enjoying.*" Thus this philanthropist—this champion of freedom—this foe to despotism—this hater of monarchs and monarchy—has the impudence to revile the English for punishing the perfidy, and checking the destructive ambition of one of the most treacherous, the most cruel, the most oppressive, and the most arbitrary tyrants that ever disgraced a throne: a sovereign, who, in violation of solemn treaties, and of the rights of humanity, had thrown some hundreds of English soldiers into prison, and had murdered numbers of them. But Tippoo Sultaun and Tom Pain seem to have a certain congeniality of soul and sentiment, that renders them fit companions for each other, and I have not a doubt but they would willingly cement their union with the blood of the English!

I have now exhibited my principal charges against this culprit, and it remains with the people of England to pass sentence. His crime, I confess, to me appears of infinite magnitude: It is no less than an attempt to excite a mutiny of our troops; an insurrection of our workmen; and a tumult among the poor; to dethrone our sovereign, and disinherit his family; to subvert our laws, and overturn our constitution. That any man could be found to associate with a wretch of this description excites my astonishment; but that an Englishman could be found publicly to plead his cause, makes me blush for my country.

The fashionable cry of the discontented and seditious has, of late, been "*Liberty and Equality;*" the sound of the former is so grateful to the ear of an Englishman,

Englishman, that it gives an indirect kind of sanction to any thing that accompanies it. Hence the expression has passed current with many *real* friends of freedom, who, captivated with their favourite word, have neglected to examine its spurious companion. But the fact is, that liberty and equality, so far from being friends, cannot possibly subsist together:—Where liberty reigns equality is a stranger, and where equality prevails liberty can never be found. In the republic of Sparta, the only state in which the establishment of a perfect equality was ever attempted, whence money, commerce, and the arts were expelled to prevent the acquisition of wealth, where the land was equally divided, where every man was *obliged* to perform stated services, to dine at the *same* table, and eat the *same* food, though the citizens were equal among themselves, yet the most abominable of all inequalities subsisted in the encouragement of *slaves*, by whom the citizens were served, and over whom those champions of equality exerted the most cruel *tyranny* 23. When the poor man is told he shall be as rich as his neighbour, his cheek glows with exultation, and he thinks himself about to become the happiest of mortals; but what will he say when assured that an equal distribution of wealth, among the members of the community, so far from contributing to their happiness, would render them all miserable; and so far from relieving them from the necessity of working, would greatly encrease the labour of the most laborious? I cannot illustrate this position better than by quoting the following dia-

3 Lysurgus, by whom this curious system of equality was established, ordered the girls of Sparta to perform the same exercises as the boys, and, on certain solemn festivals, to dance naked like them, and at the same place.

logue,

logue, from a book published about twenty years ago, and which many of my readers may not have perused. The dialogue is held between Mr. Wildgoose and Jeremiah Tugwell, a shoemaker.

"How hard it is"—said Jerry—"that some people should be forced to toil like slaves, while others live in ease and plenty, and the fat of the land."

"An Jerry"—says Wildgoose—"true happiness does not consist in meat and drink, but in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost; and I am convinced there is not that difference in the real enjoyments of men which you imagine. You only see the outside of the wealthier part of mankind, and know nothing of the care and anxiety they suffer, which is frequently more insupportable than any bodily labour which poor people undergo."

"Odsbobs,"—says Tugwell—"If I had but as good a dinner every day as I had yesterday at the justice's, I would not value of a straw all the care and anxiety in the world."

"Well,"—replies Wildgoose—"but these distinctions amongst mankind are absolutely necessary; and, whilst men have the liberty of doing as they please, it cannot be otherwise. I suppose you would have every body provided for alike; so that no one should be either very rich or very poor."

"Why,"—says Jerry—"methinks it is very hard, that one man should have five or six hundred pounds a year, when another mayhap has not fifty."

"Well, then,"—replies Wildgoose—"we will suppose that you and I, Jerry, and all the people of our parish, and in the next parish, and in the next market town, and so on, had each a hundred pounds a year, and no more."—"Aye, that I should like now well enough."—"Well, then,

G

"but

“but where should I get my shoes made?”—says Mr. Wildgoose.—“Troth, master, you must even make them yourself, for I should work for nobody but myself and our Dorothy.” “Well,” says Wildgoose, “and where would you buy your leather?” “Why, of Mr. Jones, the currier, at Evesham.” “Where would you get your awls, hammers, and cutting-knives?” “Why, from Birmingham.” “Very well; and where would you get your cloaths made?” “Oh! Isaac, our taylor, should work for me, he is a very honest fellow.” “Ah! Jerry”—says Mr. Wildgoose—“thou dost not consider that all these people would be fully employed in working for themselves; so that for all thy hundred pounds a year, thou must not only make thy own cloaths, but raise thy own corn, build thy own house, make thy own chairs and tables, thy own linen, stockings, shoes, and buckles; and, in short, either every man must work ten times harder than the poorest man now does, or, if he were idle or extravagant, those that were more frugal and industrious, would again grow rich, and the others poor; which shows the unavoidable necessity of that inequality with which your complaint began †.”

In fact it is madness to say that in this world a state of perfect equality can exist: in a state of nature, superiority of strength, cunning, or agility, must destroy equality as effectually as superior frugality, industry, or genius, in a state of society. Pain, for the establishment of his absurd doctrine of “The equal Rights of Man,” was obliged to go back as far as the days of *Adam*—here he was safe, for when there was but one man, there could, of course, be no in-

equality of persons; and, with equal consistency, he wisely appeals to *Adam* as authority in matters of government, who, existing alone, could neither govern nor be governed.

Yet even the Scriptures have been perverted to uphold a doctrine which reason disavows and the executive council of France have lately declared * that the "sacred writings breathe the purest democracy, the most perfect equality"—Pain, indeed, had said almost the same thing in his Common Sense †. But how is this to be reconciled with the promise of the Lord to Rebecca "that two nations should spring from her womb, one of which should serve the other," or to the sale of the rights of primogeniture under the divine sanction? Or to the prophetic blessings of the Patriarchs;—"Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee; be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee." Or to the difference made between the descendants of Ham, &c.

The Apostles, too, teach a different doctrine. *Saint Peter* says "Submit yourselves to every ordinance

* In a Letter to the Pope.

† From various passages in "Rights of Man," and from other circumstances, strong conjectures may be formed that Pain has long been in the pay of the Jacobine party in France; under whose influence and direction he appears to me to have acted. The measures pursued by the National Convention, since he has taken his seat there, confirm me in this opinion. The system which they now propose, is the same which he has supported; and the hostile measures adopted for engaging England in a war, seem to be the consequence of his advice. His inveterate enmity to this country has been openly displayed since his return to France; and in the *written speech* he delivered to the Convention, on the subject of the king's trial, he grossly insulted every Englishman, in the person of his sovereign, whom the miscreant dared to abuse in the most virulent manner. But the day of retribution, we trust, is not far off.

“ of man for the Lord’s sake—Whether it be to the
 “ King as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them
 “ that are sent by him. Honour all men—love the
 “ brotherhood—fear God—honour the King—ser-
 “ vants be subject to your masters:”—*Saint Paul*
 says “ Let every soul be subject to the higher powers,
 “ They that resist shall receive to themselves dam-
 “ nation—render therefore to all their dues—tribute
 “ to whom tribute is due—custom to whom custom
 “ —honour to whom honour.”—Here is nothing of
 “ The equal Rights of Man,” of the “ purest de-
 “ mocracy, the most perfect equality;” but these
 writers were only inspired by God, whereas Thomas
 and his Jacobines seem to have been inspired by
 a power, that has much greater influence in France,
 —The DEVIL.

The only equality that man can know upon earth,
 is that political equality which forms the leading fea-
 ture in our own glorious constitution; where the
 laws are equally binding on all; whether exerted for
 the purpose of protection or of punishment they ex-
 tend alike to the rich and the poor; in England,
 thank Heaven, the power to oppress is unknown;
 the sovereign himself has no right to enter the cot-
 tage of the peasant, without the *permission* of its
 owner. Under the influence of such laws, freedom
 is secure, and property safe; no invidious exclusions,
 no monopoly of rank or power is authorized; the
 road to wealth and honours is open to every man; the
 means of elevation are infinite: industry, applicati-
 on, genius, either separate or combined, can raise
 men from the lowest to the highest stations of life.

The end and object of all human governments,
 are the welfare and happiness of the people; and in
 no government, either of ancient or modern times,
 have these been so much consulted, or so successfully
 promoted,

promoted, as in that of Britain. In no country of Europe is the *soldier* so well paid, or possessed of so many privileges; in no country of Europe are the wages of the *workman* so high; in no country of Europe are the *poor* so amply provided for, and, in no country of Europe are the people, less burthened with taxes! In England, commerce, fostered by freedom, daily extends her empire, opening new sources of industry, and thereby facilitating the acquisition of splendid fortunes.

To confirm these blessings, and even to extend them, we have only to remain true to those principles, and firm to that conduct to which we are indebted for their existence. OBEDIENCE TO THE LAWS IS THE SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY. “A people who have
 “any morals,”—says Rousseau—“and, consequent-
 “ly, respect the laws, cannot be too much upon
 “their guard against the specious and dogmatical
 “maxims of philosophers, which, by teaching them
 “to despise the laws and customs of their country,
 “lead to a general and inevitable corruption of
 “manners.”

I would willingly have avoided any allusion to the situation of a neighbouring country, had the nature of my subject permitted me; but when the constitution of France is held up to us as an object to admire, and an example to pursue, I am forcibly led to reprobate the preposterous idea, of exchanging good for evil, wealth for poverty, order for anarchy, virtue for vice, and happiness for misery. But waving all conclusions to be drawn from the present dreadful situation of France, without government and without laws, what were all the promised advantages of their boasted declaration of rights? They were these—*That all men should be equally bound by the laws—that every man should have the power of doing every thing*
 which

which the law does not prohibit—that no man should be imprisoned or otherwise molested but as the law prescribes—religious toleration—liberty of the press—that taxes should be equally laid—and laid by the representatives of the people—that the agents or ministers of the government should be amenable to public impeachment—the inviolability of private property. Admitting these rights to be fully enjoyed by the French, is there any one of them that has not been long, long ago, secured to Englishmen? Most certainly not. What then is the object proposed by the change? The introduction of ruin, that needy rogues may profit by the spoils of their country.

But the rights above mentioned though *declared* are certainly not *enjoyed* by the French—How does their present conduct to their unhappy sovereign square with the declaration, that—“*no man shall be imprisoned or otherwise molested but as the law prescribes?*” That the *liberty of the press* is abolished, appears from the impossibility of procuring at Paris, (I speak from *experience*) any publication, however moderate, that contains sentiments hostile to those of the prevailing faction. The fact is, that notwithstanding the cry of liberty and equality; the most oppressive tyranny—the tyranny of a delegated Banditti—pervades every part of that distracted country.

The effects produced by any system of government constitute the best test of its excellence; and if the people be wretched we may safely conclude that the government cannot be good. What the gross amount of the taxes, in France may be, I am not, at present, competent to say †; but this I *know*, that

† To Pain's statement I pay no kind of attention; his object is to mislead; and the man who stands convicted of the most notorious falsehoods is wholly undeserving of credit.

people

people of landed property are assessed at nearly a third of the net produce of their estates; and if *taxes be equally laid* the amount must be enormous; but I apprehend that the assessment and collection of taxes are conducted with the most shameful partiality; indeed some instances of this kind, within my own knowledge, I could cite, were I not restrained by private considerations. But what more immediately concerns the people of France, and I wish the people of England also to attend to the circumstance, is the enormous rise, which has taken place in the price of all the necessaries of life. Before the Revolution, meat was sold, in Normandy, at four pence and four pence half-penny a pound; whereas it now costs eight pence and nine-pence; and the three-penny loaf is raised to five-pence. Good walking shoes used to sell in France at four livres ten sols or five livres (from three and nine-pence to four and two-pence) whereas they are now sold at Paris—though all the town-duties are suppressed—at seven livres ten sols (six-shillings and three-pence)—and that by the army contractors, who, of course, can afford to sell them at the lowest price. It is of mighty little consequence to a man who possesses a hundred a year and pays five pounds in taxes, to be told that his taxes shall be lowered to three pounds, if, by the operation which is to produce that change, the price of provisions, &c. will be so raised that what now costs him ten pounds will then cost him eighteen or twenty! Yet this is the mighty advantage enjoyed by the French; and to obtain this we are advised to plunge ourselves into misery and resign all the benefits we derive from equal laws and a free government.

It has been repeatedly said, that the accounts of the enormities committed in France, since the period of the

the

the revolution, have been grossly exaggerated : Such assertions may suit the purposes of *party*, but they are gross violations of truth. I affirm, on the authority of a person, whose name I forbear to mention because I wish not to expose him to the danger of assassination, but for whose veracity I pledge myself—a person, I say, established at Paris long before the revolution, and who did not leave that metropolis till after the massacre of the tenth of August, that the accounts given in such of our papers as appeared most violent against the French (*The Times*, for instance) were rather *palliated* than *exaggerated*. Indeed, the crimes, both against God and man, perpetrated by the detestable party of the Jacobins, scarcely admit of exaggeration. Nor were the numerous murders committed at Paris during the last summer the effect of sudden provocation or momentary rage—they were deliberately planned, systematically arranged—and executed in cold blood. Regular bands of assassins paraded the streets, forcibly entered the houses of peaceable citizens, and were frequently seen to pursue the unhappy objects of their rage, over the roofs of the houses. The Parisians, indeed, have in all times of public commotion been distinguished for their ferociousness and cruelty ; at the massacre of the Armagnacs, in 1418, the acts of barbarity of which they were guilty almost exceed belief † ; at the massacre of the Hugonots

† On the twelfth of June, the dreadful scene began : the populace frantic with rage, flew to arms, forced open the doors of the prisons, murdered the gaolers and guards, made the prisoners walk out one by one, and massacred them as they passed, Armagnacs, *Burgundians*, criminals, debtors, all were butchered without distinction of rank, age, or sex. Not a prison nor dungeon escaped the active malignity of these sanguinary ruffians. The grand Châtelet made a vigorous resistance ; its wretched inhabitants

gonots in 1572, the greatest destruction and most cruel deeds were performed by the citizens, led by their *municipal officers*; and the conduct of the inhabitants of the capital from the commencement of the Revolution to the present day shews that their disposition, in this respect, has not degenerated.

Yet these are the men with whom we are urged to associate; whose alliance we are invited to court! At a period when that treacherous country endeavours, by means of her secret emissaries †, to excite an insurrection in England, and by attack-

tants ascended the towers, and attempted to repel the attacks of the mob; for some time they exhibited the strange sight of prisoners sustaining a siege; at length, however, the building having been fired in different parts, they were compelled to surrender. The merciless rabble then forced these miserable victims to precipitate themselves from the tops of the towers into the streets below, on pikes which they held to receive them. In the courtyard of the palace, and in the environs of the gates of Paris, so dreadful was the massacre, that the mob stood "*up to the ankles in human blood!*" When the barbarians had cleared the prisons, they spread over the different parts of the town; not a street but was the scene of numerous murders; whoever wished to get rid of an enemy, a rival, or a creditor, had only to point him out as an *Armagnac*, and he was instantly dispatched. Hist. of France, vol. II. p. 456.

† It is notorious that the agents of the French Jacobins now in London, for the purpose of sowing sedition in this country, are very numerous. They particularly frequent a house of great resort for foreigners in Jermyn-street, where, to avoid suspicion, they pass themselves for *Emigrants*. It is one part of the mission of those miscreants to irritate the minds of the people against the real Emigrants; a virtuous and unfortunate set of men, who, refusing to sacrifice their principles to their interest, and to incur the Guilt of Perjury, were robbed of their property, and being banished, like criminals, from their country, were compelled to relinquish their friends, their families, and connections. The former are just objects of indignation, and will not, I trust, escape the vengeance of the law: But the latter have the strongest claims to our protection—*charity* is a duty strongly inculcated by the holy author of our religion, and it never can be exercised on more worthy objects. The same spirit that impels an Englishman to resent injuries, prompts him to relieve distress, and to protect the friendless and oppressed.

ing our allies to provoke us to war, we are advised to shew her an act of favour and condescension, by acknowledging the constitution she has founded on the dissolution of all moral and religious ties. And by whom is this advice given? By the very men, who, on the proposal for a commercial treaty with France in 1787, reprobated the idea of any kind of connection with a people whom they stiled our natural political enemies. Mr. Fox, in his speech of the thirteenth of February, (1787,) exerted his utmost abilities to encourage and confirm that rooted enmity which England had for ages maintained against her treacherous rival: He declared "that he
 " could never be brought to believe that France
 " was sincere when she professed to be the friend of
 " Great Britain:" He remarked, "that notwithstanding the levity of French manners, notwithstanding the constitutional mutability of that people, yet, to the astonishment of all the world, during
 " all their changes of administration, they had, for
 " more than a century, kept to one regular and constant idea, that of *overweening pride* and *natural aggrandisement*: Anxious to grasp at a more than
 " due influence over the other powers of Europe, France had endeavoured by different means to attain her object." He represented the true situation of England to be "that of a great maritime
 " power, looked up to by the other powers of Europe, as that to which the *distressed should fly for assistance*, whenever *France unjustly attacked them*
 " with a view to the attainment of her favourite object." He maintained that a wise minister ought
 " with respect to France to procure an alliance for
 " Great Britain with some maritime power that could
 " assist her whenever France thought it a fit moment
 " to attack her.—He declared, "he had lately
 " heard,

“ heard, and with much true joy, that the probability of our once again recovering our situation with “ *Holland*, was encreased—He was sincerely glad of “ it”—Yet now Mr. Fox tells us “ the internal state of “ *Holland* is such” (certainly not worse than in the year 1787 when the Dutch were in a state of open rebellion) “ that the balance of her alliance may be found in the end much against us *.”

Mr. Grey, in his maiden speech, upheld the same doctrine, and maintained the same principles: he reprobated “ the boundless ambition of France—our “ natural rival, if not our natural foe, and the repeated instances of perfidy she had evinced in the “ course of her transactions at all periods with Great “ Britain”—“ He doubted much of her assurances “ of her cordial amity, and her fair professions of “ reciprocity and regard.” He asked “ what had “ lulled our constitutional jealousy to sleep, and “ whether it evinced, either policy or prudence in “ Great Britain to abandon *her old prejudices* and assume a new feeling towards France!”—He was convinced—“ That while France was holding out “ the most liberal professions of amity and sincere regard towards this country, she was intent on the

† Till I read Mr. Fox’s speech on the address—I would not believe that the speech said to be delivered by him at the whig Club was really his.—The promulgation of the sentiments of a public character on great constitutional questions through the medium of *toasts*, has at least the recommendation of novelty; and the season of the year is peculiarly favourable for such a production, which will no doubt make a conspicuous figure among the conundrums and acrostics at the end of the *Lady’s Almanack* for the year 1793.—Perhaps though Mr. Fox’s constituents may hereafter think it worth their while to enquire, why, in the hour of *patriotic* conviviality, when the mind naturally expands and truth will out, that gentleman should have *toasted* the independent freeholders of Hertfordshire, and Northumberland, while he totally overlooked the independent electors of Westminster.”

“ pursuit

“pursuit of her grand object *the annihilation of the greatness of Britain in the scale of Europe, the reduction of her power and the ruin of her navigation and marine*” he declared that it had been the uniform aim of France “to diminish British greatness and to render us as much politically insulated as we were insulated in regard to our local situation.”—

On what grounds has this *puny* statesman changed his opinion? why does he now “*exult in the aggrandisement of that natural rival, whose invariable aim has been the diminution of British greatness?*” If he cannot answer the question himself, the people of England will answer it for him. They have sufficient penetration to distinguish *party rage* from *patriotism*, and open professions of enmity to our natural foes, from secret encouragement of their treacherous designs.

I blush for my country when I see such a veteran politician as Mr. Fox so far forget the principles he has ever avowed, so far depart from the dignified pride and independent spirit of an Englishman, as to advise us to throw ourselves at the feet of a foreign assembly, exhibiting a monstrous compound of wickedness and folly—to supplicate the national convention of France—a wretched band of perjured traitors †,

† I shall, probably, be told by the critics, that *abuse* is not *argument*: but as I am a plain man, and have little of the French *politesse* about me, they must permit me to use my own expressions, and, if I can prove a man a rogue, to call him so. Now let me ask them; is there a member of the National Convention, (Thomas Paine excepted) who has not taken a solemn oath to maintain the constitution, as established by the constituent assembly, and to obey the nation, the law, and the king? And have they not since abolished that constitution, violated that law, and dethroned that king?—They certainly have—I am therefore as much justified in calling them a band of perjured traitors, as I should be in calling a man a highwayman who had been convicted of stealing my purse on the road.

who,

who, after violating all property, treating with contempt the rights of nations, and destroying every tie that binds man to man, are about to complete the sum of their iniquity by the assassination of their sovereign—A sovereign too, whom the man that urges us to this disgraceful measure, has himself proclaimed “A Lover of Justice, and the Friend of his Country ‡,”—an eulogy confirmed, in more ample terms, by a noble marquis, who is now pursuing the same line of conduct.

Is Mr. Fox prepared to say, that the French are not, at this instant, a more dangerous foe than they were at any period of the monarchy? That the same principles which applied to the prevention of their aggrandisement in 1787, or at any former period, are not more strongly applicable to their present situation? That the motives on which he grounded the impolicy of a connexion between this country and France, do not now subsist, and in a much greater degree? And, that it is not our interest, as well as our duty, to fulfil the terms of our treaty with Holland, and to check the diffusion of French principles, and the progress of the French arms? On this ground I shall ever be ready to meet him, and, notwithstanding the immense disproportion of talents, I am confident of victory: but my confidence is founded not on vanity but reason.

I am no friend to *national enmities*; but if there ever was a time in which prudence and policy required the encouragement of an *Antigallican spirit* in England, this is surely the period. And I heartily subscribe to the following declaration of a member of parliament, made on another occasion. “My serious opinion and deliberate conviction are, that the nearer

‡ See Mr. Fox's Speech in February, 1787, quoted above.

the two nations are drawn into contact, and the more successfully they are invited to mingle and to blend with one another, in the same proportion the remaining morals, principles and vigour of the national English mind, will be enervated and *corrupted*."— Rather, therefore, my countrymen, shun all intercourse with a people, who are now, more than ever, our enemies, who revile us in their writings, insult us in their speeches, and seek to sow discontents among us, that we may be disabled from resenting the insult offered to our ally †, and from inflicting the just punishment of their perfidy. That their enmity to us has subsisted since the revolution, is notorious, though great pains have been taken to propagate a contrary opinion. In a work written in the year 1790, by M. Dupont, a member of the first National Assembly, entitled, "Considerations on the politics of France, Spain, and England," the author desires that the court of France should summon that of England to disarm immediately, and that the *English nation* should be informed that if she refused to comply, the French nation "swore, upon her honour, that she would instantly repair to London, in order to enforce a compliance with her proposals." The answers, he says, must be prompt, "for either England must begin to disarm in a week, or hostilities must commence in a month." In a speech of Brissot, (in July 1791) the editor of a factious print, member for Paris, in the last national assembly, and one of the

2 By one of the articles of the French Constitution, it was declared that "All offensive war was unjust." This article, as well as the rest, the French *swore* to observe; yet, in direct violation of that oath, they are about to *attack* the Dutch, who have, during the whole progress of the revolution, preserved the strictest neutrality. Such wholesale dealers in perjury, never before disgraced humanity.

leading

leading members of the present convention, the following curious paragraph appears—"Is England the power that appears so formidable to our pusillanimous politicians? Overwhelmed with the enormous weight of her debt, which is daily encreasing, the vain parade of her armaments against Russia, and the disastrous war in India, she has every thing to fear for herself;—impossibility of paying off her debt, the loss of her possessions in the East-Indies, her separation from Ireland, and the constant emigrations from Scotland. Though she extend her conquests, and multiply her fleets, still her debt does not diminish: give her, for allies in India, the versatile Nizam; the perjured Mahratta;" (it becomes Brissot to talk of *perjury* truly) the nominal emperor—still the English empire is not secure—it exists but in imagination:—It is impossible, then, that this dream of imagination can exist much longer." A hundred other instances might be quoted to prove the *rooted hatred* of the French republicans to the *English nation*; but, I trust, the eyes of the people are sufficiently opened to their perfidy, and their arms prepared for resistance and punishment. The fields of Crecy, Poitiers, and Azincourt, are deeply engraven on the minds of Britons; who will convince these daring freebooters, that they still retain their wonted superiority in arms, as well as morals; in courage, as well as integrity.

It is with heart-felt satisfaction I view the glorious spread of loyalty, so widely diffused over this favoured country. I detest adulation almost as much as I abhor calumny: but praise founded on truth is the tribute of justice: and he who performs, with exemplary virtue, the duties of a husband, a father and a man, is justly entitled to the highest commendation, whether he grace a cottage or a throne.

Let

Let the people of England remain firm and united, and they have nothing to fear from the attempts of their foreign enemies, or the more insidious machinations of domestic traitors: let them remember that insubordination is destructive of liberty, as obedience to the laws is her surest safe-guard: and let them convince the world that **THE FIRMEST FRIENDS TO FREEDOM ARE THE MOST DETERMINED FOES TO LICENTIOUSNESS!**

Dec. 15th. 1792.

